

3/31/70

Dick and Howard, re Dick's 3/19s

Given the fact that you know neither Lifton nor Newcomb, your explanation is logical as hell and is no less reasonable to you than it would be to anyone not knowing them. Lifton, especially, is much more devious than you will (perhaps ever) know. He is bright enough and capable of anticipating exactly what you figured. If you doubt this, ask Gary, who has had his own shocks. There is a strange love-hate feeling Fred has, but he always winds up doing Dave's bidding. I can show you letters in which he brags about throwing him out of the house- more than two years ago. They contrive and invent things together. And Fred, although a boxer in his younger day and still built like it (also as of two years ago), is basically cowardly.

However, this now seems to be as good as it can be. We'll just have to wait and see. Dave may give it up or he may let it wait a while.

I read the letter at the P.O. early this a.m., before going to DC. I read your memo to Howard at supper. It is excellent, really great, particularly the first two paragraphs, which I encourage Howard to reread. The distinction between knowledge of forensic pathology and knowledge of the basic fact is a quite important one, too.

Your comment on p. 7: If this aspect interests Howard, it seems to me a safe form is Frazier's, which I quote in WW and can be found via the index. He disputed Specter on this being a high-velocity bullet and said it was of medium velocity. For a military rifle, Dick, do they come much slower?

Comment on p. 11: Sorry I didn't show Howard the Remington-Peters catalogue when he was here. I once suggested he get one, as he can from any sporting good store.

Re 18FF. I'm the last guy to disagree, having decided not later than April 1966 there was a front shot (too an ACLU lawyer to see it, little goof that his state of shock did) and having said so in WWII. However, and this is in no way disagreement with you, Paul is working on the opposite, and he a) knows the evidence and b) is a physicist. We'll see.

26. This is a significant statement, at least partly garbled, for Humes did not dictate the autopsy report.

Your suggestion at the top of p.3 is very good advice.

Re p. 30, all the pieces are not lost. I've got some of them and I'm getting more. As Howard knows. And you should have some ideas by now.

Phone, p. 4: would you consider the possibility that he had been told this guff about the cramping helping by one or more he trusted and believed, not having any idea of those things that make it impossible. I don't think he is stupid.

PS also very good and important for Howard to understand. He has recently had personal experience with the press! We differ in degree. I blame all of them.

I haven't even read the motion we filed today.

Didn't have time even to phone Archives today.

Best,